

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, and 4-14 are pending in the present application after this amendment cancels claim 3 and adds new claim 14. Claims 1, 4 and 7-9 have been amended. No new matter is added by the amendments and new claims, which find support throughout the specification and figures. Additionally, it is respectfully requested that the amendments be entered since they do not raise new issues, simplify any issues for appeal, and/or place the claims in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has not acknowledged receipt of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on May 26, 2005 and June 16, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests acknowledged PTO forms 1449 for the two Information Disclosure Statements in the Examiner's next communication to the Applicant.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109802 to Cheng et al. (hereinafter Cheng). Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 3, and therefore this claim, as well as claims 2, 5, and 6 which depend from claim 1, are discussed herein below in regard to the rejection of claim 3. Claim 7 has been amended to include some of the features of claims 8 and 9, and therefore this claim is discussed herein below in regard to the rejection of claims 8 and 9.

Claims 8-10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of United States Patent No. 6,806,919 to Sato (hereinafter Sato) and Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art (hereinafter AAAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant submits that, at the time of the invention of the present application, the present application and Sato were commonly assigned, or under an obligation to assign, to NEC LCD Technologies, Ltd., of Kawasaki, Japan. Therefore, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (c), Applicant

submits that Sato may not be properly combined with Cheng to render the present application unpatentable.

Since amended claim 7 includes features of both of claims 8 and 9, and since Sato is not a proper reference pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (c), Applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over Cheng and AAAPA. In particular, neither Cheng nor AAAPA discloses or suggests a liquid crystal display device that includes a liquid crystal display unit that includes a backlight unit supplying backlight to said liquid crystal display panel, in which a light-guide and a light-reflector both constitute said backlight unit, as recited in claim 7. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references disclose or suggest this feature, and therefore for at least this reason claim 7 is allowable.

Claims 8-10 and 13 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 7 is allowable.

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of United States Patent No. 6,879,308 to Hsieh et al. (hereinafter Hsieh). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 3 has been canceled and the features of canceled claim 3 have been amended into claim 1.

Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine Cheng and Hsieh. The Office Action states, without support, that it would have been obvious to combine the purported features of Cheng and Hsieh to arrive at the present invention (*See e.g.*, Office Action; page 4, lines 4-10 and lines 17-19; page 5, lines 8-12). Applicant respectfully requests a citation to a one or both of the cited references supporting a motivation to combine the references, or alternatively, that the rejection be withdrawn. Cheng relates to a mobile phone display unit, while Hsieh relates to a

housing for a flat panel display. It is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to combine the references, and therefore the combination of the references is improper.

Therefore, since the combination of the references is improper, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 7 is allowable, as discussed above.

New independent claim 14 includes the features of claims 7, 11, and 12, and therefore new claim 14 does not necessitate additional searching. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that new claim 14 be entered and examined.

Applicant submits that new claim 14 is allowable. Claim 14 relates to a liquid crystal display device including a liquid crystal display unit for displaying images, and a case having a rigid hollow rectangular cross-section in which said liquid crystal display unit is installed. In claim 14, the case is formed with an opening through which said liquid crystal display unit is slid into and out of the hollow rectangular cross-section of said case. According to claim 14, the opening is closed by bending a part of the case or by a cover composed of the same material as the case.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references disclose or suggest this feature, and therefore new claim 14 is allowable. Since there is no motivation to combine Cheng and Hsieh, as discussed above, claim 14 is allowable for at least this additional reason.


**CONCLUSION**

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the rejections in the Office Action. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the independent claims are in condition for allowance, as well as those claims dependent therefrom. Passage of this case to allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper, not fully covered by an enclosed check, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian E. Hennessey  
Reg. No. 51,271

**CUSTOMER NO.: 026304**

Phone No.: (212) 940-6311  
Fax No.: (212) 940-8986/7  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: NECE 20.585  
BEH:pm